DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 210 JC 690 243

By-Bagnall, Joseph A.

A Contingency Plan to Thwart SDS Disturbances at Fullerton Junior College.

Pub Date 68

Note-30p.; Seminar paper

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-*Activism, *Demonstrations (Civil), *Junior Colleges, Student Behavior, *Student College Relationship, Student Organizations

Identifiers-California

The threat of campus disruption by the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) at Fullerton Junior College (Calif.) provided the basis for this report. An account of the attempt by the SDS to organize at Fullerton and a brief history of the movement were presented. Challenges posed by the SDS were examined along with the causes of student unrest in an effort to formulate a plan to quell student activism. The suggested plan was comprised of the following steps: isolate and discredit SDS leaders before they establish a following; alert students in advance of expected attempts to disrupt instruction; take a "hard line" with demonstrators; initiate reform in the area of faculty-student-community relationships; develop an imaginative and interesting community service program; provide a relevant curriculum; and listen to potential supporters of SDS and accede to reasonable demands. The report also included a series of documents pertinent to the problem of campus disruption. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (MB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Contingency Plan to Thwart SDS Disturbances at Fullerton Jr. College

by Joseph A. Bagnall

A Paper Submitted to

The Graduate School of Education

of

The University of California at Los Angeles

in

partial fulfillment of the requirements
for

Education 441D

Dr. Ralph Prator

Fall 1968

Contents

pages

1. A Contingency Plan to Thwart SDS Disturbances at Fullerton Jr. College.....1-12
2. Document No. I The Berkeley Student Revolt 1964.....13-15
3. Document No. 2 How to Prevent Riots.....16-17
4. Document No. 3 Proposed FJC-SDS Constitution.....18
5. Document No. 4 SDS Goals for Fullerton Jr. College.....19
6. Document No. 5 Hoover: A Report on Campus Reds.....20-21
7. Document No. 6 Hoover: Students for a Democratic Society.....22-23
8. Document No. 7 War Research at the Universities.....24
9. Bibliography.....25-28

A Contingency Plan to Thwart SDS Disturbances at Fullerton Junior College

In his last "Welcome Address" to the Fullerton Jr. College faculty, President H. Lynn Sheller warned that in the 1968-1969 academic year there was a grave possibility of a campus explosion at Fullerton Jr. College; and he counseled that attempts to organize a chapter of Students for a Democratic Society would probably be made as a first step to local campus chaos. Our retiring President also contended that Students for a Democratic Society was permeated with radical and revolutionary elements.

Dr. Sheller's remarks were poorly received in some quarters of the gathering; there was even an unprecedented challenge from the floor during the course of his address. At that particular moment, it seemed that Dr. Sheller was unduly concerned about what might happen on our conservative campus--and ill-informed on the salient characteristics of Students for a Democratic Society. It has taken less than one full semester, however, to confirm that his apprehensions were realistic and well-founded; and more of us are now coming to realize that his characterizations of SDS were true.

Sheller's prediction regarding the attempt to form an SDS chapter has materialized, not only at Fullerton Jr. College, but also at her sister institution in the North Orange County Junior College District-- Cypress Jr. College. Each attempt has been abortive, however, because the Board of Education refused the applicants a charter on the grounds that SDS objectives are not commensurate with the educational goals of our district.

Tactically, this was a sound move, for with lack of official recognition SDS is branded from the outset as renegade--without sanction or credence. In a community with strong middle-class traditions, this will be important. Particularly, if, in the long run, our administration (1) identifies and isolates the radical SDS organizers, and (2) cuts off the supportive element of SDS by instituting needed reforms.

The attempt to organize an FJC-SDS has involved the following activity: (1) On campus meetings which featured discussions of a student movement to boycott the bookstore, a petition to recall members of FJC student government, a petition to relieve Dean of Men, Ivan C. Malm of his duties, possible disruption of instruction and other topics; (2) Distribution of mimeographed sheets outlining SDS goals for Fullerton Jr. College.

The stated goals are:

I. Factual Student control of all policies, issues and activities concerning the student. We therefore will strive to establish:

a) a non-profit bookstore
b) more direct student control of ASB funds and activities
c) a student review board
d) abolishment of the dress code
e) more adequate parking facilities
f) student employment in more campus jobs

II. Greater student involvement in social and political issues. In this regard we shall work to obtain:

a) on-campus draft counseling
b) freedom of the press on campus
c) an open center for community-student interaction
d) a centrally located free speech center
e) an unrestricted outside speaker policy (See Appendix, Document No. 4)

In the abortive attempt to implement these goals as a recognized campus organization, FJC-SDS organizers submitted an ill-prepared constitution which, even with liberal spacing, fills only a 2/3 portion of one page. (See Appendix, Doc. No. 3)

With this inauspicious beginning, however, notice has been served. Our campus, too, can become a battleground along with countless others. Dr Sheller's warning at the outset of the 1968-69 academic year about SDS attempts to organize on our campus was prophetic. And now Clay N. Mitchell, Orange County Superintendent of Schools, has alerted local residents to the very real danger of SDS campus take-overs in the area schools. (36:5)

With the hope that SDS "talk" at Fullerton J.C. never gets translated into action-- with the faith that student unrest can be anticipated and averted-- your author proposes to examine some of the challenges posed

by Students for A Democratic Society, historically. As a result, special insights should emerge concerning the character of the movement. An attempt will then be made to combine these insights with an examination of the myriad causes of student unrest-- for the purpose of formulating a contingency plan to quell student activism at Fullerton Jr. College.

Students for a Democratic Society was founded by about 60 people at Port Huron, Michigan, in 1961. The founders meeting produced an SDS credo, the "Port Huron Statement" drafted chiefly by a student from the University of Michigan named Tom Hayden. This document is the basic rationale for the leaderless, decentralized, "participatory democracy" in which SDS chapters give every member's view equal weighting. It states,

> "...We seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation, governed by two central aims: that the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation. (12:23-24)

Supplanting the Students League for Industrial Democracy, SDS has "spun off" to a (fall 1968) membership of 7,000 dues-paying students on 300 campuses. (It boasts support of 35,000 other students, publishes New Left Notes (circ. 30,000), and elects a governing board or National Council in an annual convention. National offices of SDS are located at 1608 West Madison St., Chicago, Ill., 60612.

In 1963 a philosophy for SDS was set down in two papers co-authored by Tom Hayden. One dealt with the military-industrial complex in the United States as a threat to peace. The other proposed that SDS should help the poor in white and black ghettos.

By 1964 SDS was involved in welfare and rent strikes in chiefly white ghettos in 17 cities. SDS also teamed up with SNCC in the summer of 1964 to assist in the Mississippi Negro voter registration. (34:3-4;48:81)

In the same year, Mario Savio was leading the first major student revolt of the 1960's at the University of California at Berkeley. In many ways it was the prototype of campus explosions now occurring all over the world. In 1964, however, this "Free Speech Movement" was non-violent. Eight hundred students were arrested in the protest. It took policeman thirteen hours to drag the "limp" students off to jail; (45:60) but more importantly for SDS, an important new tactical approach was in evidence.

By 1965 SDS organized the first anti-Vietnam war teach-in at the University of Michigan; in the same year it led the first antiwar march of 25,000 to Washington D.C. and organized "Free Universities" on many campuses. At this time, J. Edgar Hoover warned of many campus Reds. (18:84 See also Appendix, Doc. No. 5)

In 1966 SDS set up counseling services on campus to help students avoid the draft. It also passed a black power resolution in support of SNCC. In the same year, J. Edgar Hoover testified before the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations, making the following salient points about Students for a Democratic Society:

1. "Communists are actively promoting and participating in the activities of this organization."
2. "A National convention of this organization was held at a camp near Kewadin, Michigan, in June, 1965. Practically every subversive organization in the United States was represented by delegates to this convention...Also represented were the Communist Party, U.S.A..."
3. The leadership of SDS is strongly pro-Communist.
4. The activities of SDS have been, and will likely continue to be, planned and directed to help establish a Communist America. (See Appendix, Doc. No. 6)

In 1967 SDS began demonstrating against R.O.T.C. units. They harassed Dow Chemical Company (makers of Napalm) on various campuses, and attacked C.I.A. and the Institute for Defense Analysis. (48:81) SDS delighted in exposing facts and figures comparable to the ones published in Esquire, September, 1968, on defense contracts, classified contracts, Atomic Energy Commission contracts, and NASA contracts for the major universities. (49:88-90 or see Appendix, Doc. No 7)

In 1968 SDS led a series of explosive campus take-overs. By the end of June, 18 major universities had experienced partial occupation or sit-ins. (41:31-32) During May alone, the following events transpired: (1) Four hundred students occupied the old student union at Stanford in protest against the CIA; (2) Five hundred students marched on Nassau Hall at Princeton, demanding that (a) the authority of the school trustees be limited, (b) school ties be broken with the Institute for Defense Analysis, (c) dorm visiting rules be suspended, and (d) a draft counseling program be instituted; Students barricaded the administration building at Cheyney State College in Pennsylvania demanding a better faculty and curriculum; Roosevelt University, in downtown Chicago, expelled or suspended forty-five students who participated in a sit-in; the president of Florida State University resigned in the wake of a student protest; fourteen black students were arrested at Miami University after they had taken-over the president's office; and students successfully banned government agencies and corporations from recruiting on campus at Oberlin. (37:72)

The most serious campus disruption of 1968, however, was at prestiguous Columbia University. The SDS led revolt shut down "the entire school, caused an estimated $300,000 damage and led to a general student strike and the arrest of 720 people." (47:81) And more alarming, still-- "In recent months student revolts have erupted in more than a dozen major industrial nations around the world." Student radicals in the capitalist countries seem to agree that capitalism must be overthrown. (42:42-43; 40:278-279) And syndicated columnists Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson have linked Columbia University SDS president Mark Rudd with Rudi Dutschke in Germany and "Danny the Red" Cohn-Bendit in France. (12:25)

Why have dangerous student radicals garnered so much support on our nation's campuses? Is it because of the general appeal of its critique of our society? SDS maintains that "the present

American corporate capitalist system manipulates and oppresses the individual...(and) a corporate/military elite...profits while the rest of the citizenry are only depersonalized pawns in the game....The nation's universities are key accomplices in this process, furnishing research and ideas to the military-industrial complex and psychologically conditioning students to take their places submissively in the corporate slots that await them." (12:25) Perhaps this anti-capitalist rationale suffices to polarize that vague sense of anti-bureaucratic sentiment upon which students around the world agree.

Some interesting hypotheses have been advanced concerning the causes of student unrest in the United States. S. L. Halleck has examined some of them which seem pertinent at this time. He speaks of a "Critical Hypothesis," and cites some of the current easy judgments of the elder generation about the lack of discipline and purpose in youth; the "Permissive Hypothesis" is a closely related theme; the "Non-Responsibility Hypothesis" tends to malign Freud and insist that individuals are responsible for their actions, and behavior should be examined in the context of good or bad; the "Affluence Hypothesis" stresses student disenchantment with materialism and a life devoid of meaning; the "Family-Pathology Hypothesis" emphasizes a disturbed family; the "Sympathetic Hypothesis" insists that youth is victimized with unbearable pressure; the "Two Armed-Camps Hypothesis" cites pressure from competition in the cold war as the source of student tension; the "Deterioration in the Quality of Life Hypothesis" emphasizes overcrowding and ugliness; the "Political Hoplessness Hypothesis" explains that students feel society is too complex, checks and balances frustrate meaningful political change, pressure groups cancel one another out, and it is impossible to make meaningful change in the system; the "Civil Rights Hypothesis" relates student unrest to their empathy with Negroes; the "Technological Hypothesis" stresses rapid environmental change and student distrust of the future with its attendant emphasis on the need to live for now; the

"Media Hypothesis" draws from Marshall McCluhan's theory of a global village in which frustrations are communal or shared; Halleck prefers the "Neutral Hypothesis" which claims student unrest derives from impersonal processes and "changes in highly complex society (which) create (a) need for new modes of psychological adaptation." (14:2-9) In a sense Halleck's view is eclectic, since he gave measured support to all hypotheses.

According to Joseph Shoben, Director of the American Coundil on Education's Commission on Academic Affairs, "An analysis of 71 of the student disturbances which have occurred since October 1966, indicates that 68 of them were related either to the Vietnam War or to the race problem, or to both." (8:1205) He further explains that students are most apt to revolt

> 1. When a faculty or an administration is considered to be unresponsive to students' expression of concern.
> 2. When students feel they have been excluded from participation in decision making that affects their own conduct or freedom of expression.
> 3. When institutions are accused of injustice because they contract to perform war-related research, offer facilities for government-sponsored speakers to talk about Vietnam, or fail to show eagerness to enroll Negroes.
> 4. When a student rebel achieves some form of "martyrdom" such as expulsion, suspension or arrest.
> 5. When a sizable number of liberals are willing to join revol s to force reforms. (52:38)

J. L. Walsh explains what today's student wants by carefully listing what he hates. Where society is concerned, it is

> 1. depersonalization.
> 2. bureacratization,
> 3. gradulism,
> 4. Vietnam War, and
> 5. living in the most organized, technologized and bureacratized society the world has ever known.(48:209)

In place of all this, insists Walsh, the student wants "democratic participation" and control over his life. (48:207-208)

Katz and Sanford list the following causes of student unrest:

1. Tightening of standards since Sputnik

2. work demanded of students can't be filled a 40 hour week.
3. a lack of community on campus
4. depersonalization
5. university preoccupation with technology
6. students are more sophisticated as a result of travel, modern communications, and increased opportunity. They demand their right to share in the decisions of their own education. (21:64-66)

Bill Ward, Associate Professor of Journalism at Syracuse, believes student unrest is caused by

1. self justification to compensate academic failure.
2. demagogues,
3. the excitement of demonstration, and
4. loss of identity. (50:81-82)

Norman Cousins writes of impersonality, disconnection and dehumanization as causes of campus disturbances; (10:20) And adds, students are seeking "workable guidelines for their lives;" they are also engaged in a quest for individual self respect. For those of us who would lecture this generation on violence, Cousins believes, the "basic causes of violence can be found in the mirror..." Says he, our society countenances violence in Vietnam; violence can be perpetrated easily with guns obtainable by anyone. We have cut down some of our greatest men...."the basic causes of violence can be found in the mirror and will not yield to dismay, disgust, or despair." (11:28)

It seems fitting to close the segment of this paper devoted to causes of student unrest with some perceptive comments in a Time essay. Students are protesting, says Time, because they demand relevance and involvement. They have taught us two important lessons: "(1) some of the changes they want are really improvements, and (2) the way to deal with student power is to anticipate it, to initiate changes before the students demand them." Students and elders need to learn more mutual respect. (56:24-25)

One would be led to suspect, for many reasons, that full-scale student demonstrations will never develop at Fullerton Jr. College. The root causes of student demonstrations seem to be lacking here. The school is not involved in war research; a two year student tenure seems insufficient to build either serious attachments or grievances; we lack the Negro enrollment to make possible the kind of black/white radical alliance which has caused such great disturbance at San Francisco State; (51:70-72) we are not faced with responsibility for regulating students lives in dormitories; our instructors, for the most part, relate closely with students in seminars, field trips, and informal discussions; relationships between faculty and students are warm and personal; and the strong tradition of middle class respectability still prevails. Yet-- the attempt to organize student activism has begun. Given this hard fact of life, it seems reasonable to plan for any eventuality.

The contingency plan to thwart SDS disturbances at Fullerton Jr. College herein presented is based on a number of assumptions. First, it is assumed that eventually SDS activities on this campus will follow the familiar patterns of mass sit-ins, mill-ins, disruptions of speakers and ceremonies, and disruption of classes. Second, it is assumed that the people at the vortex of these disturbances will be radicals and anarchists. Third, it is assumed that if SDS organizers are to successfully lead such activities, they must have a substantial following. The first problem, therefore, is to isolate and discredit the organizers before they have built a substantial following. Information about the character of SDS should be widely shared.

Only a small minority of students will be interested in identifying with a movement which openly boasts that it is a coalition of "socialists, anarchists, communists, and humanist liberals." (34:4-5) Most students will not support an organization which harbors, in the words of FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, "a new type of subversive...financed by the Communist party." (12:23)

Humanist liberal students should be reminded that men with liberal credentials-- syndicated columnists Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson-

have also pointed out the subversive nature of the SDS leadership.

SDS organizers have been identified with drugs in the past. Tom Hayden chided President elect Richard Nixon recently on network television (CBS Face the Nation, Dec. 8) for speaking out against drugs. Many SDS organizers are vulnerable to arrest on possession of drugs; this tac has been employed to break hard-core SDS activity elsewhere; and it should be employed wherever feasible. (38:60)

The Mulford Bill, passed by the California legislature and signed by Governor Brown, June 2, 1965, makes it a "misdemeanor for any non-student or any non-employee to remain on a state university or state college campus after he or she has been ordered to leave... (as a result of) an act likely to interfere with the peaceful conduct of the campus." (44:154-155) If this bill does not apply to junior colleges, we need similar legislation now-- and should work for it immediately.

It might be well to alert students in advance of an expected attempt to disrupt instruction. It is claimed by Edwin E. Willis, (Dem. La.) Chairman of House Committee on Un-American Activities, that if one publicizes an expected student strike in advance, the planned propaganda effort will be stifled. (36:10-11)

If the situation finally deteriorates to "demonstrations" on campus, it seems that the best approach is "hard line." It is instructive that the horrible confrontation at Columbia resulted in 178 arrests (Mark Rudd, Pres. of SDS too). All who were arrested were suspended from Columbia and now face expulsion.(53:8) Columbia has seemed to quiet down as a result. At San Francisco State, in the same Spring, the administration granted four of the radical students five demands-- and faced greater problems this fall. It is best, it seems, to deal harshly with the hard core SDS

As important in dealing with potential student unrest, however, is campus reform. Radical agitators can be isolated, discredited and destroyed through effective faculty-student-community relationships.

In the recent Joint Student-Faculty Report on how to avert future disorders at the University of California at Berkeley, the following points were made in support of students: (1) a decentralization process is needed " in order to interweave students, faculty and administrators into a community seeking common goals....Students should sit on the key committees within departments to help shape policy and would also help evaluate the teaching of their professors. These local constituencies would then feed into a more representative- and entirely reorganized- student government and faculty academic senate. (See Appendix, Doc. No. 2)

Michael Regin, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of California at Berkeley is convinced that this student generation has great sophistication. As he puts it, "To get to learn from them, as I was fortunate enough to do during the year of the Berkeley revolt, was a remarkable experience..." (32:99) and he seems disposed to share policy making decisions with them now.

Professor Garbarino, Director of Business and Economics Research at Berkeley, writes of a near future when professors may have no other choice. "Administrative authority will be increasingly limited in all types of organizations," he asserts, and "The 'consent of the governed' principle will be extended to employer-employee relations, and bargaining out of decisions will be generalized over most of our organizations." (28:171-172)

A recent article in School and Society points out that "In the last 40 years, the Harvard Student Council has produced 12 printed reports on specific issues. This is one of the reasons we hear less about Harvard disorders than we do at many institutions." (15:56)

Many are saying, at this juncture, if we would save our educational institutions, we must reform them. "Student government must be strengthened and given a significant voice in the governance..." (6:1206 See also 12:32-33)

Even the trustees of some institutions are calling for more "student power." Thomas L Boardman of Oberlin has gone so far as to "welcome some form of student representation on the Board of Trustees." (46:59)

At the junior college level it seems that a number of imaginative programs in community service can be developed with student participation. Exciting speaker series with first-rate talent should be developed through the community service tax. A program comparable to the one at Monterey Peninsula College, in 1959-1961 should captivate student interest. In one academic year at Monterey they had Eleanor Roosevelt, John Mason Brown, Norman Cousins, William O. Douglas, Clement Atlee, Martin Luther King, James Baldwin, Aldous Huxley, Margaret Meade, Santha Rama Rau, William Winter, Felix Greene, Peter Odegard, and others in their evening lecture series-- financed with the community service tax. Student morale and commitment to the institution was phenomenal.

A relevant curriculum is needed to avert student unrest. This will entail programs and studies in which Negroes can find identity. Other minorities need programs which are meaningful for them as well.

It is imperative that we now prepare to listen, learn, and adapt. We must be willing to work with potential supportive elements of SDS and accede to reasonable demands. We must try to avert further violence before it prepares the way for the police state. More than one perceptive analyst has cautioned us about the violent backlash which could result from wholesale disorder. (24:39 See also 13:13)

The urgency of the task is described by C. G. Austin,

> Recent silent generations of students have prompted those who administer colleges and universities to hope that we are going through another phase of student life which will soon pass, and consequently, to adjust their mode of operation as little as possible in the face of protests. We suspect, however, that students are defining a new and permanent place for themselves in affecting policy decisions, and that those who now govern our colleges and universities would be well advised to work with students in creating a pattern in which there are effective alternatives to demonstrations. (2:4)

Document No. I

The Berkeley Student Revolt 1964

Student protest became a prominent feature of academic life, for the first time, in the 1960's. The first major student "revolt," and possibly the prototype, was the Free Speech Movement at the University of California at Berkeley, led by students who had worked in the civil-rights movement but involving, at its peak in December 1964, large numbers of undergraduates. The immediate precipitant of the rebellion was an order of the university administration prohibiting various forms of political agitation on the campus, but the scope of the protest widened until it became an attack on the impersonality, excessive specialization, and prostitution of knowledge which the students associated with the "multiversity" -- a concept of the university of which Clark Kerr, happened to be the leading spokesman. The following speech by Mario Salvo, an undergraduate philosophy major who emerged as the leader of the FSM, was delivered during a sit-in of eight hundred students in Sproul Hall during the night of December 2, and it shows that much more was involved, for the students, than a narrow issue of university procedure.

Eventually the faculty voted its support of the program of FSM, but the deeper issues remained.... of the generational rift and the rejection of American society by increasing numbers of young people -- feelings which would soon be further stirred by the war in Vietnam, which subsequently became the principal focus of student demonstrations.

Mario Savio-- "An End to History" December 2, 1964 (Humanity, December, 1964)

...In our free speech fight at the University of California, we have come up against what may emerge as the greatest problem of our nation-- de-personalized, unresponsive bureaucracy. We have encountered the organized status quo in Mississippi, but it is the same in Berkeley. Here we find it impossible usually to meet with anyone but secretaries. Beyond that, we find functionaries who cannot make policy, but can only hide behind the rules. We have discovered total lack of response on the part of the policy makers. To grasp a situation which is truly Kafkesque, it is necessary to under-stand the bureaucratic mentality. And we have learned quite a bit about it this fall,more outside the classroom than in.

As bureaucrat, an administrator believes that nothing new happens. He occupies an a-historical point of view. In September, to get the attention of this bureaucracy which had issued aribtrary edicts suppressing student political expression and refused to discuss its action, we held a sit-in on the campus. We sat around a police car and kept it immobilized for over thirty-two hours. At last the administrative bureaucracy agreed to negotiate.

Document No. I

The Berkeley Student Revolt 1964 (continued)

But instead, on the following Monday, we discovered that a committee had been appointed, in accordance with usual regulations, to resolve the dispute. Our attempt to convince any of the administrators that an event had occurred, that something new had happened, failed. They saw this simply as something to be handled by normal University procedures.

The same is true of all bureaucracies. They begin as tools, means to certain legitimate goals, and they end up feeding their own existence. The conception that bureaucrats have is that history has in fact come to an end. No events can occur now that the Second World War is over which can change American society substantially. We proceed by standard procedures as we are...

This free speech fight points up a fascinating aspect of contemporary campus life. Students are permitted to talk all they want so long as their speech has no consequences.

One conception of the university, suggested by a classical Christian formulation, is that it be in the world but not of the world. The conception of Clark Kerr, by contrast, is that the university is part and parcel of this particular stage in the history of American Society; it stands to serve the need of American industry; it is a factory that turns out a certain product needed by industry or government. Because speech does often have consequences which might alter this perversion of higher education, the university must put itself in a position of censorship. It can permit two kinds of speech, speech which encourages continuation of the status quo, and speech which advocates changes in it so radical as to be irrelevant in the foreseeable future.

...The University is well structured, well tooled, to turn out people with all the sharp edges worn off, the well-rounded person. The University is well equipped to produce that sort of person, and this means that the best among the people who enter must for four years wander aimlessly much of the time questioning why they are on campus at all, doubting whether there is any point in what they are doing, and looking toward a very bleak existence afterward in a game in which all of the rules have been made up, which one cannot really amend.

Document No. I

The Berkeley Student Revolt 1964 (continued)

It is a bleak scene, but it is all a lot of us have to look forward to. Society provides no challenge. American society in the standard conception it has of itself is simply no lonner exciting. The most exciting things going on in America today are movements to change America. America is becoming even more the Utopia of sterilized, automated contentment. The "futures" and "careers" for which America students now prepare are for the most part intellectual and moral wastelands. This chrome-plated consumers paradise would have us grow up to be well-behaved children. But an important minority of men and women coming to the front today have shown that they will die rather than be standardized, replaceable and irrelevant.

-Henry Steele Commager, ed. Documents of American History. 8th ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968. pp. 720-21.

Document No. 2

How to Prevent Riots: University of California at Berkeley Joint Student-Faculty Committee to Study Ways to Avert Future Disorders.

After a series of campus uprisings, the University of California at Berkeley last January (1967) set up a joint student-faculty committee to study ways to avert future disorders. This week the committee-- headed by Law Professor Caleb Foote and graduate student Henry E. Mayer-- released a 250 page report that charged almost everybody involved in past troubles with pursuing "partisan ends" but also recommended some sound proposals as to how the school should govern itself.

The report was quite indiscriminate in its criticism of the present university setup. It argued that Governor Ronald Reagan was "consistently unfriendly" and that the regents had proved "ineffectual in protecting the freedom and integrity" of the school-- both propositions that are open to debate. It blamed the university president for failing to give each campus enough autonomy, and Berkeley Chancellor Roger Heyns for not developing a meaningful dialogue with the faculty. The professors, in turn, operated in "a milieu of confusion and uncertainty"-- not to mention indifference--with respect to their powers. Too many students, the report said, displayed "an appallingly high rate of disaffection and disinterest toward" their own education. The result was "an atmosphere of distrust and suspicion."

The committee's basic solution to the problem is decentralization in order to interweave students, faculty and administrators into a community seeking common goals. Thus it urged the regents to confine themselves to setting broad policy-- something proposed by the regents' own Byrne Report (Time, May 21, 1965)-- and recommended that administrators delegate as much authority as possible to local campuses.

At Berkeley, the report proposed breaking up such unmanageable units as the Freshman and Sophomore years of the College of Letters and Science, which has some 6,600 students, into small colleges grouped around related disciplines, each with power to hire and promote teachers. Students would sit on the key committees within departments to help shape policy and would also help evaluate the teaching of their professors. These local "constituencies" would then feed into a more representative-- and entirely reorganized -- student government and faculty academic senate.

Document No.

How to Prevent Riots....(continued)

On the key issue of how the university should maintain order at Berkeley -- assuming that dialogue will not resolve all tensions -- the report proposed that the chancellor should not get directly involved with administering campus discipline. Under the present system, it argued, the chancellor appears to be both prosecutor and judge, which inevitably makes him seem like the students' adversary. Instead, the committee suggested that a new set of campus regulations, subject to the chancellor's veto, should be drawn up by a rules committee representing faculty, students and administration. Violators would be brought to a judgment before a student-conduct court composed of four students and four faculty members. If convicted, a student could appeal to the chancellor for a mitigation of punishment. As for clear violations of criminal law, that would be left entirely in the hands of off-campus courts.

-- Time, (January 19, 1968), p. 34.

Document No. X

Proposed FJC-SDS CONSTITUTION
(Rejected by the Student Commission)

Article I NAME

The name of this organization shall be the Fullerton Junior College Chapter of Students for a Democratic Society (FJC-SDS).

Article II MEMBERSHIP

Membership is open to all students and faculty members of Fullerton Junior College who share the basic aims of this organization.

Article III PROCEDURE

The principle of "participatory democracy" shall govern the conduct of all meetings and activities.

Article IV PURPOSE

The purpose of FJC-SDS shall be those expressed in the Preamble to the National SDS Constitution:

"Students for a Democratic Society is an association of young people of the left. It seeks to create a sustained community of educational and political concern; one bringing together liberals and radicals, activists and scholars, students and faculty. It maintains a vision of a democratic society, where at all levels the people have control of the decisions which affect them and the resources on which they are dependent. It seeks a relevance through the continual focus on realities and on the programs necessary to effect change at the most basic levels of economic, political, and social organization. It feels the urgency to put forth a radical, democratic program whose methods embody the democratic vision."

The above is a copy of the Constitution FJC-SDS submitted for recognization as a campus club. This document along with a list of twenty students must be approved by the Dean of Women, the Student Commission, the Committee on Student Affairs, and the President of the College. FJC-SDS would much rather see students and not the administration have the final decision on the approval of student clubs. Until that day when students control student government, we will attempt to work through the "proper channels." And hope the administration has the wisdom to decide the best for us.

"Students are niggers. When you get that straight, our schools begin to make sense."

...Jerry Farber "The Student as Nigger"

Document No. 4

SDS Goals for Fullerton Jr. College
(mimeographed sheet)

is an association of young people of the left. It seeks to create a sustained community of educational and political concern; one bringing together liberals and radicals, activists and scholars, students and faculty. It maintains a vision of a democratic society, where at all levels the people have control of the decisions which affect them and the resources on which they are dependent. It seeks a relevance through the continual focus on realities and on the programs necessary to effect change at the most basic levels of economic, political, and social organization. It feels the urgency to put forth a radical, democratic program whose methods embody the democratic vision.

Preamble, SDS Constitution

It is with this vision that we are forming a SDS chapter at Fullerton. We will begin by working for changes on our campus in the following areas:

1. Factual student control of all policies, issues and activities concerning the student. We therefore will strive to establish:
   a) a non-profit bookstore
   b) more direct student control of ASB funds and activities
   c) a student review board
   d) abolishment of the dress code
   e) more adequate parking facilities
   f) student employment in more campus jobs

II. Greater student involvement in social and political issues.
   In this regard we shall work to obtain:
   a) on-campus draft counseling
   b) freedom of the press on campus
   c) an open center for community-student interaction
   d) a centrally located free speech center
   e) an unrestricted outside speaker policy

Our first step toward these objectives will be the publication of a series of newspapers composed of student articles, announcements, SDS positions, and other items of interest to the student. Those wishing to join FJC-SDS, help us, contribute articles to the paper, or who simply desire more information should meet in room 1002 of the Home and Fine Arts Building, at 4 PM today. National SDS policy and our confirmed consensus dictate that our membership shall be open to all who share the commitment of the organization to democracy as a means and as a social goal.

Document No. 5

From J. Edgar Hoover: A Report on Campus Reds. Testimony given before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on March 4, 1965. A transcript of his report was made public on May 17. Following are excerpts from Mr. Hoover's testimony:

Demonstrations at the University of California were initiated October 1, 1964, by a small group of students who formed an organization called the Free Speech Movement--FSM-- which demanded the right to engage in political activities on campus in local, State and national elections, in violation of university regulations.

Demonstrations continued through October and November, in spite of overtures and concessions by the university administration to the demands of the demonstrators....

On December 2, 1964, approximately 1,000 demonstrators gathered in Sproul Hall, University of California, and refused to leave, resulting in Governor Brown of California issuing orders to arrest those who refused. Accordingly at 3:45 a.m., December 3, 1964, over 600 police officers arrested 780 demonstrators who refused to leave Sproul Hall. The arrests were without violence or injuries.

Mario Savio, student leader and spokesman for FSM and the demonstrators, has a previous arrest record for sit-in demonstrations. During the period November 10-14, 1964, Savio was on a speaking tour of colleges in the Midwest and East seeking financial support for the arrested students. A close adviser who accompanied him on this tour was Bettina Aptheker, member of the W.E.B. DuBois Club of Berkeley--a Marxist-oriented youth organization--and daughter of Herbert Aptheker, publicly identified in the Communist newspaper "The Worker," in its issue of July 30, 1961, as a member of the national committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Individuals with subversive backgrounds who participated in the demonstrations included five faculty members and 38 individuals who were students or connected with the University of California in some capacity. This is another example of a demonstration, which, while not Communist-originated or controlled, has been exploited by a few

Document No. 5

From J. Edgar Hoover: A Report on Campus Reds (continued)

Communists for their own end. In this instance, a few hundred students contain within their ranks a handful of Communists that mislead, confuse and bewilder a great many students to their own detriment.

Communist party leaders feel that, based on what happened on the campus of the University of California at Berkeley, they can exploit similar student demonstrations to their own benefit in the future....

On February 8, 1965, about 1,3000 demonstrators (at the University of California) protested U.S. intervention in Vietnam. Speakers, condemning the United States for starting the war in Vietnam, included Herbert Aptheker, a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and other party members who "just happened to be there." All speakers urged their listeners to more direct action and called for a demonstration at the New Federal Building in San Francisco.

At Madison, Wis., at the University of Wisconsin, a similar protest meeting held by students and faculty members, some of whom have Communist backgrounds. One of these was Daniel Friedlander who is active in the DuBois Clubs in Madison.

The major lesson to be learned from all this is that the Communists and their supporters in this country are not a weak, insignificant element on the American scene.

The wave of demonstrations which erupted on a national scale immediately following news of the U.S. counterstrike against Communist forces in Vietnam demonstrates how unified, organized and powerful an element the Communist movement in the United States is today.

While many of the demonstrations were organized by legitimate, sincere pacifist groups, Communists and their supporters also organized a number of demonstrations and are attempting to exploit to their own benefit the activities of the legitimate organizations.

-U.S. News and World Report, (May 31, 1965), p. 84.

Document No. 6

Students for a Democratic Society
February, 1966 testimony of
J.EDGAR HOOVER, Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
before House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations

Mr. Hoover. One of the most militant organizations now engaged in activities protesting U.S. foreign policy is a student youth group called Students for a Democratic Society. Communists are actively promoting and participating in the activities of this organization, which is self-described as a group of liverals and radicals. This organization currently claims a membership in excess of 3,000 in over 100 chapters throughout the United States, and its members are most vocal in condemning the American way of life and our established form of government.

This organization sponsored a march on Washington to protest U.S. action in Vietnam which took place on April 17, 1965. Communists from throughout the Nation participated in this march and over 70 past or present Communist Party members from New York City alone, including several national leaders, were observed among the participants.

A national convention of this organization was held at a camp near Kewadin, Mich., in June 1965. Practically every subversive organization in the United States was represented by delegates to this convention. There were delegates from the Young Socialist Alliance, the youth and training section of the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party, which has been designated as subversive pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

Also represented were the Communist Party, U.S.A. and the Spartacist group, a Trotskyite splinter organization. Other delegates represented the Progressive Labor Party, a Marxist-Leninist organization following the line of Communist China, and the May 2 Movement, a front group of the Progressive Labor Party.

At this convention, a number of proposals were made to further oppose the U.S. action in Vietnam. One Students for a Democratic Society leader called for deliberate violation of the sedition statutes by Students for a Democratic Society members which it was hoped would result in mass arrests and a "political trial" of the organization. Members were urged to attempt to enter military bases to persuade soldiers that they should refuse to fight in Vietnam.

At a meeting of the national council, the governing body of the Students for a Democratic Society which was held over the 1965 Labor Day weekend, 20 of the approximately

Document No. 6

Students for a Democratic Society
February, 1966 testimony of
J.EDGAR HOOVER, Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
before House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations
(continued)

100 participants had past or present affiliations with the Communist Party or other subversive groups. A vigorous antidraft program was proposed at this meeting, which included plans to counsel draft-age youth on how to avoid the draft. This proposal was later submitted to the Students for a Democratic Society membership by referendum for approval but was defeated by a narrow majority.

In spite of this, Students for a Democratic Society leaders recently announced that each local chapter would make its own decisions as to whether an antidraft program would be undertaken by that particular chapter.

During the last week of December 1965, the antidraft program and the Vietnam protest movement again were subjects which dominated discussions at a national membership conference of this group held at Urbana, Ill. Heated exchanges took place between various factions, some of which wanted to continue with a "hard line" and others wanting to retreat entirely from all protest activity in connection with the Vietnam issue. Although no foreign policy decisions resulted from this conference, the Students for a Democratic Society has continued to sponsor and participate in demonstrations throughout the United States protesting U.S. action in Vietnam.

Document No. ?

War Research at the Universities— Germ Warfare, Psychological Warfare, and Rocketry

(Extracted from Esquire, September, 1968. pp. 88-90

	Defense Contracts	Classified
Stanford University	$45,492,000	$16,500,000
Illinois Inst. of Tech.	$14,700,000	$ 4,000,000
Univ. of Washington	$ 5,618,000	$ 425,000
Geo. Washington Univ.	$ 4,500,000	$ 3,100,000
Univ. of Texas	$ 4,600,000	$ 2,000,000
John Hopkins Univ.	$71,041,000	$55,100,000
Univ. of Pennsylvania	$ 4,833,000	-0-
American Univ.	$ 2,668,000	$ 2,200,000
Univ. of Michigan	$17,700,000	$10,300,000
Mass. Inst. of Tech.	$92,423,000	$46,000,000
Columbia Univ.	$16,416,000	$ 8,757,700
Ohio State Univ.	$ 4,795,000	$ 2,387,176
Univ. of Illinois	$10,960,000	$ 100,000
Penn. State	$12,000,000	$ 3,500,000
Univ. of Calif.	$17,353,000	$ 6,500,000
Cornell Univ.	$23,824,000	$11,000,000
Calif. Inst. of Tech.	$ 4,189,000	-0-
Princeton Univ.	$ 4,831,000	-0-

	AEC Contracts	Classified AEC
Univ. of Calif.	$255,000,000	$76,000,000

	NASA Contracts	NASA Classified
Calif. Inst. of Tech.	$200,000,000	Secret

Bibliography

1. "Anarchy Spreads in U. S. Colleges," U. S. News and World Report, (May 6, 1968), 64:65.

2. Austin, C. G. "Student Protests and the Establishment," Journal of Higher Education, (April 1968), 39:223-225.

3. "Berkeley 1966," Commonweal, (December 23, 1966), 85:337.

4. Blumenthal, R. "SDS Protest is Not Enough," Nation, (May 22, 1967), 204:656-660.

5. Brickman, W. W. "Student Power and Academic Anarchy," School and Society, (January 6, 1968), 96:6.

6. "Campus Agitation vs. Education," Life, (January 22, 1965), 58:4.

7. "Campus Protest, Yes, Violence, No," Life, (December 2, 1966), 61:4.

8. Carter, L.J. "Student Unrest: Administrators Seek Ways to Restore Peace," Science, (June 14, 1968), 160:1205-1208.

9. "Climate at Berkeley: Discipline and the Issue of Political Protests," Time, (December 25, 1964), 84:30.

10. Cousins, Norman. "Escalation in California," Saturday Review, (January 30, 1965), 48:20.

11. Cousins, Norman. "What Are Young People Telling Us?" Saturday Review, (May 18, 1968), 51:28.

12. Dunbar, Ernest. "Vanguard of the Campus Revolt," Look, (October 1, 1968), 32:23-29.

13. Halle, L. J. "Student Drive to Destruction," New Republic, (October 19, 1968), 159:10-13.

14. Halleck, S.L. "Hypotheses of Student Unrest," Phi Delta Kappan, (September 1968), 50:2-9.

15. "History of College Student Unrest," School and Society, (February 5, 1966), 94:56.

16. Hofstadter, Richard. "Columbus Ordeal," Phi Delta Kappan, (September 1968), 50:15-17.

17. Hook, Sydney. "Freedom to Learn, But Not to Riot," New York Times Magazine, (January 3, 1965), p. 8-9.

18. Hoover, J. E. "A Report on Campus Reds," U. S. News and World Report, (May 31, 1965), p. 84.

19. Hoover, J. E. "Turbulence on the Campus," P.T.A. Magazine, (February 1966), 60:4-6.

20. "How to Prevent Riots: University of California at Berkeley Joint Student-Faculty Committee to Study Ways to Avert Future Disorders," Time, (January 19, 1968), p. 34.

21. Katz, J. and N. Sanford. "Causes of the Student Revolution," Saturday Review, (December 18, 1965), 48:64-66.

22. Kramer, J.R. "What Student Power Means," New York Times Magazine, (May 26, 1968), p. 32-33.

23. Lipset, S.M. "Rebellion on Campus," American Education, (October 1968), 4:28-31.

24. Lipset, S.M. and Seabury, P. "Lesson of Berkeley," Reporter, (January 28, 1965), 32:36-40.

25. Lowman, D. "New Student Left," bibliography. National Association of Women Deans and Counselers, (Winter 1968), 31:57-63.

26. Mitchell, Clay N. (Orange County Supt. of Schools) "SDS: Tell Plan to Take Over Area Schools," Buena Park American, (November 13, 1968), p. 5.

27. Morley, F. "What's Behind the Student Demonstrations?" Nation's Business, (March 1966), 54:25-26.

28. Morphet, Edgar L. and Charles O. Ryan. Designing Education for the Future No I: Prospective Changes in Society by 1980. New York: Citation Press, 1967.

29. Newfield, J. "Revolt Without Dogma: The Student Left," Nation, (May 10, 1965), 200:491-495.

30. Proposed FJC-SDS Constitution. Mimeographed Sheet.

31. "Rioters Beware! Bill to Cut Off Federal Loans and Grants," Senior Scholastic, (October 25, 1968), 93:16.

32. Rogin, M. "Politics of Outrage: Notes on the Student Left," Commonweal, (April 15, 1966), 84:99-102.

33. Schlesinger, Arthur M. Jr. "Existential Politics and the Cult of Violence," Phi Delta Kappan, (September 1968), 50:9-15.

34. SDS: An Introduction. Chicago: New Left Notes, 1608 W. Madison Street. No Date.

35. "SDS Goals for Fullerton Jr. College," Mimeographed Sheet.

36. "Soon, A Student Strike Inspired by Communists," U.S. News and World Report, (April 1, 1968), 64:10.

37. Stretch, B. B. "Student Power: May Events," Saturday Review, (June 15, 1968), 51:72.

38. "Student as Nigger," Commonweal, (April 5, 1968), 88:60.

39. Students for a Democratic Society: February, 1966 Testimony of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Before House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations. Copied from a Photo Reproduction in the Files of Fullerton Jr. College Library.

40. "Student Power," National Review, (March 26, 1968), 20:278-279.

41. "Student Power," New Republic, (May 25, 1968), 158:11-12. Discussion, (June 29, 1968), 158:31-32.

42. "Student Radicals," Excerpts from Discussion on BBC TV, Newsweek, (June 24, 1968), 71:42-43.

43. "The Berkeley Student Revolt 1964," Documents of American History, 8th Ed. (Henry Steele Commager, Ed.) New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968. pp. 720-721.

44. Thompson, H. S. "Non Student Left: Significance of the Mulford Law," Nation, (September 27, 1965), 201:154-158.

45. "To Prison with Love: Student Sit-In at University of California at Berkeley, Time, (December 11, 1964), 84:60.

46. "Trustees Take a Hand in Campus Showdown," With Editorial Comment. Business Week, (October 19, 1968), 188:58-60.

47. Vaughan, Roger. "The Defiant Voices of SDS," Life, (October 18, 1968), pp. 80-96.

48. Walsh, J. L. "What the Students Want," Commonweal, (November 19, 1965), 83:206-209.

49. "War Research at the Universities..." Esquire, (September 1968), pp. 88-90.

50. Ward, B. "Why the Students Revolt," Nation, (January 25, 1965), 200:81-85.

51. "When Student Power Gets Out of Hand," U. S. News and World Report, (April 1, 1968), 64:70-72.

52. "Why Students Revolt," U. S. News and World Report, (June 10, 1968), 64:36-38.

53. "Will Toughness Halt Student Uprisings?" U. S. News and World Report, (June 3, 1968), 64:8.

54. Wilson, L. "Induction of Student Demonstrators," School and Society, (March 2, 1968), 96:156-157.

55. Wilson, L. "Where Campus Violence is Heading," U. S. News and World Report, (May 20, 1968), 64:41-44.

56. "Why Those Students are Protesting," Time Essay. Time, (May 3, 1968), 91:24-25.